

This is a postprint version of the following published document:

Sánchez-Agüero, V.; Nogales, B.; Valera, F.; Vidal, I. Investigating the deployability of VoIP services over wireless interconnected micro aerial vehicles, in: *Internet technology letters*, 1(5), Sep./Oct. 2018, e40

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/itl2.40>

© 2018 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

---

# INVESTIGATING THE DEPLOYABILITY OF VOIP SERVICES OVER WIRELESS INTERCONNECTED MICRO AERIAL VEHICLES

---

A PREPRINT

**Víctor Sánchez-Agüero\***  
IMDEA Network Institute  
Universidad Carlos III de Madrid  
victor.sanchez@imdea.org

**Borja Nogales**  
Universidad Carlos III de Madrid  
bdorado@pa.uc3m.es

**Francisco Valera**  
Universidad Carlos III de Madrid  
fvalera@it.uc3m.es

**Ivan Vidal**  
Universidad Carlos III de Madrid  
ividal@it.uc3m.es

March 21, 2019

## ABSTRACT

Emerging technological devices, such as *Unmanned Aircraft Vehicles (UAV)* and *Single Board Computers (SBC)*, are being increasingly employed in recent years, thanks to the advances in electronics and the wide variety of sensors that are endowed. This paper aims at analyzing the viability of deploying multimedia services, focusing on the voice scenario, over wireless interconnected *Micro Air Vehicles (MAV)*, also known as drones. Towards this end, we assessed the performance both of the embedded wireless cards of current drones and also SBCs, which may be carried as payload in existing UAV solutions. Driven by the results obtained in these experiments, we then deployed an operational VoIP service over a network of commercial MAVs, to perform an experimental analysis on the resource capabilities of these devices and demonstrate that this type of service can certainly be used.

**Keywords** Micro Aerial Vehicle, Unmanned Aerial Vehicle, Single Board Computer, Drone, VoIP, WiFi

## 1 Introduction

In recent years wireless networks have evolved remarkably, optimizing communications between devices and significantly increasing the achievable throughputs, surpassing what wired networks offered a few years ago. For this reason, a plethora of innovative applications have emerged around them.

Nowadays, we are witnessing the development of novel Micro Aerial Vehicle platforms (MAVs), also known as drones, which are obtaining an increasing interest from the research community and the industry. With reduced cost and power consumption, compared with larger tactical UAVs, MAVs open new opportunities. MAV infrastructures can be used for instance in scenarios such as, surveying and mapping, civil infrastructure inspection or precision agriculture. This paper is focused in disaster situations where the cellular network is unavailable, having the potential to help emergency services increasing the efficiency of their work by deploying a Voice over IP service as contemplated in this paper (the MAV network is instantiated to allow two devices on the ground to communicate when the cellular network is unavailable). Another use case could be the use of on-board cameras to accurately inspect the disaster area. The combination of both factors, drones and wireless networks, is of great interest, and it is necessary to carry out studies to be able to analyze their performance.

The main objective of this paper is the study of MAV networks, examining the feasibility of their connection over wireless networks, performing tests in a real environment with drones. Normally, WiFi networks in MAVs are just

---

\*Correspondence: Víctor Sánchez-Agüero, IMDEA Networks Institute, Avda. del Mar Mediterraneo 22, 28918, Madrid, Spain.

used to control the aircraft and to receive video and current trends propose to extend their application. Thus, we are presenting a use case where a VoIP call over a MAV network is deployed.

In this context, this paper evaluates wireless networks performance in the 2.4 GHz band, specifically the 802.11n standard [15]. As connection nodes of these networks, two types of devices have been used. In the first place, we perform tests using Single Boards Computers (SBC), in particular, Raspberry Pi 3 Model B.<sup>2</sup> These small computers, with wireless transmission capability, can be carried by drones as light payloads (around 50gr). Secondly, after analyzing the tests performed with the devices discussed above, a deployment is performed on civil MAV, namely Parrot AR Drone 2.0.<sup>3</sup> Both types of devices are interconnected directly through their wireless interfaces, performing tests to determine the bandwidth and latency. *Related work.* Small-sized drones open new possibilities to execute mission-oriented collaborative applications [1], such as search and rescue operations, disaster management and surveillance and law enforcement.

As enablers of these type of applications, MAVs have been proposed to assist in operations of cooperative search [1][2], in emergency situations, to support the collaborative generation of images [4] or to build aerial sensor networks that aid in disaster management [3]. Besides these applications, other use cases have also been investigated, such as structure building [5] or using autonomous small UAV swarms [6] [7][8].

In addition, applications that require the coordination and communications between aerial vehicles of heterogeneous sizes and capacities have also been targeted by previous research work. In [9], the authors present a communication scheme where two UAVs provide backbone communications to a set of ground mobiles. In [10], the authors present a field demonstration of the integration of UAVs with a ground ad hoc network. In [16] [17] authors present the use of drones as small cells to provide wireless services to ground users in different scenarios. Additionally, there are different articles evaluating MAVs features [11] [12].

The main contribution of this paper relies on the experimentation with the possibilities of off-the-shelf MAVs and SBCs. The two topologies used in the tests are the most common ones in MAVs networks: full mesh topology based on broadcast distribution (all MAVs are supposed to be one hop away from each other) and star topology with a central access point that helps to route information between the nodes (typical two-hops architecture). There are obviously many other alternatives since MAVs networks are by definition very flexible (they can act as relays for instance, routing information), but in this study, we will focus in those two to set the minimum requirements.

## 2 Performance Evaluation in a controlled scenario

In this Section, we analyze the benefits that can be achieved with MAVs and SBCs. After this evaluation, we can verify if both devices guarantee the minimum requirements for a VoIP service implementation (section 3), and, at the same time, we make a comparison that will allow us to conclude the most appropriate technology for upcoming studies and developments. For this reason we decide to use very basic devices such as the Parrot AR Drone 2.0 as MAV (total diameter 55 cm including rotors), and Raspberry Pi 3 as SBC (85.60mm x 56mm x 21mm). Drones will remain on the floor since no added value is provided in this type of measurements by flying drones (and since in disaster situations drones will only fly until they reach the desired area where they will land and act as WiFi access points or relays to save battery).

For the evaluation, we are taking into account four different metrics. First, we measure the throughput to determine the maximum rate the system can process in a given time. Next, we measure round trip time (RTT) to define the delay among the devices of the network. Then, we measure jitter to check if packets will be sent in a continuous stream. Finally, to measure WiFi transmission power, we have monitored the wireless link quality and the signal level to assess received signal strength, increasing the distance between transmitter and receiver linearly.

Towards this end, we are using an ad-hoc wireless network, where the devices form a peer-to-peer network and the participants are clients and Access Point (AP) at the same time. Thanks to ad-hoc wireless network features, the topology used in the study, Figure 1, can grow without needing several wireless interfaces per device (as would be required with infrastructure mode), which is essential when working with civil/commercial drones. However, Ad-hoc mode has some drawbacks. In fact, wireless systems employing infrastructure mode (at least one AP providing infrastructure to network members) provide better performance in terms of achievable throughput than those using ad-hoc mode to establish communication.

<sup>2</sup>Raspberry Pi 3 B: <https://www.raspberrypi.org/products/raspberry-pi-3-model-b/>

<sup>3</sup>AR Drone 2.0: <https://www.parrot.com/es/drones/parrot-ar-drone-20-elite-edition#parrot-ar-drone-20-elite-edition-details>




Figure 1: MAV Star ad-hoc wireless network topology




Figure 2: MAV scenario used in the experiment

## 2.1 Scenarios definition

For the experimental investigation, we have used three drones and three SBCs, with a separation of 15 meters among them for outdoor measurements, as seen in Figure 2. In order to perform measurements, we directly use these nodes. First, we measure traffic from MAV A to MAV B (1 hop). Second, we measure traffic from MAV A to MAV C adding one node (MAV B) with routing capabilities to introduce one intermediate hop (2 hops). VoIP service is deployed between MAV A and MAV C too. Measurements have been done in a controlled scenario with ideal conditions, in a WiFi channel without interferences. All tests (1 minute each) have been replicated 30 times to check the system stability over time in a real environment. Figure 3 shows the Cumulative Distribution Functions (CDFs) of the considered metrics.

All the experiments have been performed bearing in mind some considerations: (1) Traffic has been captured in a single direction. (2) The WiFi channels selected before conducting each test were those free or less busy to avoid the possible interferences.

In order to verify the existence of network connectivity between two devices and measure the RTT that can be achieved among them we use the *Ping* tool. We perform active measurements on the maximum achievable bandwidth, generating a flow of TCP/UDP traffic from the client (MAV A) to the server (MAV B or MAV C) using *Iperf* [13]. VoIP services use different codecs to compress the audio data, allowing to decrease bandwidth usage. For this reason having high capabilities to encode and decode voice data directly impacts audiovisual user experience. Signal quality and signal level (dBm) measured at different distances allows to measure the maximum distance covered by the wireless network.

## 2.2 Evaluation results

The Quality of Experience (QoE) for multimedia services, such as the VoIP application running in the following section, greatly depends on the network performance between the calling parties. To guarantee QoE in a VoIP call, we need to reach not only a bandwidth larger than 100 Kbps but also an RTT smaller than 400 ms.<sup>4 5</sup>

Regarding the throughput, as seen in Figure 3(a) incrementing one hop significantly deteriorates system performance. The performance of SBC networks is around two times better in throughput terms, concluding that SBC is more efficient in terms of throughput than directly using the on-board MAV WiFi. Observe that these results may be due to the low quality of the WiFi devices installed by default in the MAVs we are using in the experiments, as they are not professional devices. The optimal scenario is one that presents a single wireless hop, however, it would mean a decrease in the coverage reach. Examining Figure 3(b), we conclude that both technologies accomplish the minimum requirements, even though MAV networks have a better performance regarding the RTT. As opposed to throughput analysis, adding one hop does not deteriorate significantly the performance.

To verify the maximum distance to which we can provide network coverage, we have also measured the signal level at different distances. For this analysis, we have configured both SBC and MAV devices as APs to provide connectivity between them and a standard Laptop (Dell Latitude E6330) being the one performing the measurements. Note that these results and conclusions highly depend on the particular WiFi card used for tests and on the requirements set by the applications using the system. The minimum signal strength for applications that require very reliable, timely packet

<sup>4</sup>Bandwidth Requirements: <https://www.cisco.com/c/en/us/support/docs/voice/voice-quality/7934-bwidth-consume.html>

<sup>5</sup>Delay Requirements: <https://www.cisco.com/c/en/us/support/docs/voice/voice-quality/5125-delay-details.html>




Figure 3: Performance evaluation metrics

delivery, such as VoIP or video streaming is around -74 dBm [14], which gives us a maximum distance between Tx and Rx in the range of 20 - 25 meters as seen in Figure 3(c)

After all, both types of devices meet the minimum requirements to ensure QoE during a VoIP call. However, for future implementations, depending on the nature of the multimedia service and the capacities of the utilized MAV platforms, it may be convenient to use SBCs carried by MAVs as payload instead of built-in MAV resources. It can also be seen that for more complex architectures with intermediate drones used to relay information (more than 2 hops) the delay would still certainly be within reasonable limits (the additional hop has only added around 5ms and the limit is up to 400ms). The throughput is considerably reduced when adding an additional hop, due to the shared medium effect in the ad-hoc wireless configuration but this is not incremental (more hops do not necessarily imply such a severe reduction as far as the different nodes are not seeing each other).

### 3 Use case: VoIP call over MAV Network

After the performance evaluation, previous results show that it is possible to deploy a multimedia service in a MAV based network. We go one step further with the implementation of a VoIP call between two terminals (VoIP A → VoIP B) as shown in Figure 4(a). In this test we can evaluate the capacity of these limited devices to establish voice communication between two Wireless VoIP phones ZyXEL Prestige 2000W. This model supports the IEEE 802.11b standard and the establishment of audio calls using SIP and RTP. All the SBCs are connected in the same network in Ad-Hoc mode. In contrast to previous tests, we have performed this analysis in the Carlos III of Madrid University campus to validate the results in a real environment, where all WiFi channels are massively used. To capture VoIP calls traffic, we are using *Wireshark* tool and a Laptop connected to the WiFi network in promiscuous mode which allows intercept and read each network packet.

To create, modify, and terminate multimedia sessions with one or more participants we use Session Initiation Protocol (SIP). The audio packets are transported using Real-Time Protocol for delivering audio and video over IP networks that typically runs over UDP. In the central SBC (MAV B in Figure 4(a)) we have installed *Kamailio*, an open Source SIP Server supporting the registration of mobile phones and the call control functionality. Then, *Kamailio* SIP Server receives REGISTER requests from SIP phones and updates its database appropriately (ie., SIP:vsaguero@192.168.0.14 → SIP:vsaguero@kamailio.org). With the registrar function, any user can receive calls from any device supporting SIP using its unique SIP URI (ie., SIP:vsaguero@kamailio.org) which brings mobility to the system since every user can change its points of attachment to the network (i.e. the MAV used to get network connectivity, and correspondingly its IP address).




Figure 4: VoIP call deployed over MAV infrastructure

### 3.1 VoIP call

We completed several audio calls over MAV VoIP service. Figure 4(b), represents the data captured in one of the experiments (the traffic is obtained in MAV C that provides connectivity to the phone receiving the call VoIP B). The call starts after 5 sec. Then *Kamailio* sends the SIP INVITE to VoIP B originated by VoIP A. Approximately at sec. 10 after SIP ACK the multimedia session start is confirmed. Then the phones start to exchange RTP packet until the end of the call (approximately at sec. 100) terminating with a SIP BYE message. In the call, the perceived quality of the user experience has been satisfactory. However, we have analyzed the traffic during one of the experiments to quantify the quality of the call.

We are analyzing two different RTP Streams: (i) *Forward* stream, that goes from VoIP phone A to VoIP B and (ii) *Reverse* stream, that goes in the opposite direction. In such a way, we measure the quality in both directions. Figure 4(c) shows the Jitter during the deployed VoIP call. In the *Forward* stream, the maximum value was 7.59 ms and the mean value 0.83 ms. On the other hand, in the *Reverse* stream, the maximum value was 3.05 ms and the mean value 0.5 ms. All of them within expected and reasonable values.

In Figure 4(d) we show the Packet inter-arrival during the deployed VoIP call. Packet inter-arrival is the difference between the arrival time of the current packet and the arrival time of the previous packet. In the *Forward* stream, mean Packet inter-arrival value was 61.2928 ms, while the *Reverse* stream had a mean value of 61.6294 ms, both of them really close to the theoretical value. We have also measured Packet Lost. The *Forward* stream suffers a packet loss percentage equal to 2.14%, out whereas in the *Reverse* direction we a measured a packet loss equal to 2.70%.

## 4 Conclusions

The possibilities that Micro Aerial Vehicles together with Single Board Computers are offering nowadays do enable an increasing amount of new services. This paper has performed different tests in order to validate their application in WiFi based scenarios and in particular in VoIP deployments. The results show that the throughput, RTT and jitter meet the minimum requirements to guarantee QoE when a media service such as a voice call is deployed over off-the-shelf MAV networks.

It is obvious that in depth analysis are required in the future in some other critical fields such as energy consumption, to evaluate the autonomy of these devices and their short-term application in real environments, but these preliminary tests we performed on their communication capabilities have shown to be very promising for emergency scenarios.

## References

- [1] Quaritsch, M., Stojanovski, E., Bettstetter, C., Friedrich, G., Hellwagner, H., Rinner, B., ... & Shah, M. (2008, September). Collaborative microdrones: applications and research challenges. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Autonomic Computing and Communication Systems* (p. 38). ICST (Institute for Computer Sciences, Social-Informatics and Telecommunications Engineering).
- [2] Waharte, S., Trigoni, N., & Julier, S. (2009, June). Coordinated search with a swarm of UAVs. In *Sensor, Mesh and Ad Hoc Communications and Networks Workshops, 2009. SECON Workshops' 09. 6th Annual IEEE Communications Society Conference on* (pp. 1-3). IEEE.
- [3] Quaritsch, M., Kruggl, K., Wischounig-Strucl, D., Bhattacharya, S., Shah, M., & Rinner, B. (2010). Networked UAVs as aerial sensor network for disaster management applications. *e & i Elektrotechnik und Informationstechnik*, 127(3), 56-63.
- [4] Quaritsch, M., Kuschnig, R., Hellwagner, H., Rinner, B., Adria, A., & Klagenfurt, U. (2011, May). Fast aerial image acquisition and mosaicking for emergency response operations by collaborative UAVs. In *Proceedings for the International ISCRAM Conference* (pp. 1-5).
- [5] Augugliaro, F., Lupashin, S., Hamer, M., Male, C., Hehn, M., Mueller, M. W., ... & D'Andrea, R. (2014). The flight assembled architecture installation: Cooperative construction with flying machines. *IEEE Control Systems*, 34(4), 46-64.
- [6] Chaumette, S., Laplace, R., Mazel, C., Mirault, R., Dunand, A., Lecoutre, Y., & Perbet, J. N. (2011, November). Carus, an operational retasking application for a swarm of autonomous uavs: First return on experience. In *MILITARY COMMUNICATIONS CONFERENCE, 2011-MILCOM 2011* (pp. 2003-2010). IEEE.
- [7] Chaumette, S., Laplace, R., Mazel, C., Mirault, R., Dunand, A., Lecoutre, Y., & Perbet, J. N. (2011, November). Carus, an operational retasking application for a swarm of autonomous uavs: First return on experience. In *MILITARY COMMUNICATIONS CONFERENCE, 2011-MILCOM 2011* (pp. 2003-2010). IEEE.
- [8] Daniel, K., Rohde, S., Goddemeier, N., & Wietfeld, C. (2010, July). A communication aware steering strategy avoiding self-separation of flying robot swarms. In *Intelligent Systems (IS), 2010 5th IEEE International Conference* (pp. 254-259). IEEE.
- [9] Charlesworth, P. B. (2013, November). A non-cooperative game to coordinate the coverage of two communications UAVs. In *Military Communications Conference, MILCOM 2013-2013 IEEE* (pp. 668-673). IEEE.
- [10] Danilov, C., Henderson, T. R., Goff, T., Kim, J. H., Macker, J., Weston, J., ... & Uhlig, D. (2009, October). Experiment and field demonstration of a 802.11-based ground-UAV mobile ad-hoc network. In *Military Communications Conference, 2009. MILCOM 2009. IEEE* (pp. 1-7). IEEE.
- [11] Michael, N., Mellinger, D., Lindsey, Q., & Kumar, V. (2010). The grasp multiple micro-uav testbed. *IEEE Robotics & Automation Magazine*, 17(3), 56-65.
- [12] Bristeau, P. J., Callou, F., Vissiere, D., & Petit, N. (2011). The navigation and control technology inside the ar. drone micro uav. *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, 44(1), 1477-1484.
- [13] GUEANT Vivien. iPerf - The ultimate speed test tool for TCP, UDP and SCTP Test the limits of your network Internet neutrality test
- [14] Mkwawa, I. H., Jammeh, E., & Sun, L. (2012, July). Mapping of Received Signal Strength Indicator to QoE in VoIP applications over wlan. In *Quality of Multimedia Experience (QoMEX), 2012 Fourth International Workshop on* (pp. 156-157). IEEE.
- [15] Calhoun, P., Montemurro, M., & Stanley, D. (2009). Control and provisioning of wireless access points (CAPWAP) protocol binding for IEEE 802.11 (No. RFC 5416).
- [16] Yanmaz, E., Costanzo, C., Bettstetter, C., & Elmenreich, W. (2010, December). A discrete stochastic process for coverage analysis of autonomous UAV networks. In *GLOBECOM Workshops (GC Wkshps), 2010 IEEE* (pp. 1777-1782). IEEE.
- [17] Mozaffari, M., Saad, W., Bennis, M., & Debbah, M. (2015, December). Drone small cells in the clouds: Design, deployment and performance analysis. In *Global Communications Conference (GLOBECOM), 2015 IEEE* (pp. 1-6). IEEE.